

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CHRISTOPHER REECE,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

ALBERT WERNER, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:10-cv-02118-NJK

ORDER RE: MOTIONS IN LIMINE

On November 1, 2013, the Court entered an order regarding trial. Docket No. 75. That order provided unambiguously that all responses to motions in limine “shall be filed no later than January 7, 2014.” *Id.* at 1. Seven motions in limine have been filed, Docket Nos. 77-83, but responses have not been filed opposing the last four motions. Accordingly, the parties have violated a clear order of the Court.¹ Although the Court may deem those motions in limine unopposed, *see* Local Rule 7-2(d), the Court will extend the deadline to file the responses.

Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that all responses to motions in limine shall be filed no later than noon on January 9, 2014. The failure to do so will constitute a consent to the granting of

¹ The Court notes that the CM/ECF system provided an automatically-generated response deadline to these motions in limine of January 16, 2014. It should go without saying that these automatically-generated notices are not Court orders and do not somehow override the Court’s clear order setting a deadline. *See, e.g., Carrillo v. B&J Andrews Enters., LLC*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 22010, *2 (D. Nev. Feb. 19, 2013).

1 the motion. *See* Local Rule 7-2(d). To the extent that the parties do not intend to file responses in
2 opposition, they shall file a notice of non-opposition to the pending motions in limine no later than noon
3 on January 9, 2014.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: January 8, 2014

6
7 
8 _____
9 NANCY I. KOPPE
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28